MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, as the Hon'ble members are aware, this House was adjournd with a specific purpose, *i.e.*, to enable the Hon'ble Members to acquaint themselves with the havoc caused on account of floods in several parts of the State. Some of us have had an opportunity of visiting some places. I expected that the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue or the Chief Minister will report to the House the result of their investigation. There is a consensus of opinion that so far as relief measures that were taken by the Government are concerned, neither they were adequate nor timely. There is a feeling that the Government are taking these things easy. We all know that the Government are doing something but whether it is sufficient or not, is a point for consideration. I do not like to raise again any debate in this behalf but I think the Government is in duty bound to make a prompt reply to this House as to the relief measures they have taken and whether they have made any investigation.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, I want to make an amendment to his statement. This House was adjourned not to enable the members to acquaint themselves with any flood situation but to enable the Congress members to collect signatures from the District Congress members to collect signatures from the District Congress Committees and Taluk Congress Committees.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I stand corrected. I plead guilty to the charge made.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He need not plead guilty. It is a question of interpretation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If the Hon'ble member's statement is true, it makes this things worse.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It would become all right if the Speaker could consider whether the purpose for which the House was adjourned is served.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with that. But I know only that the House was adjourned.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There may be substantial truth in what my friend Sri C. M. Armugham says. Or it may be otherwise Even if the Hon'ble Minister and some members on the other side, went for that purpose, we are not bothered. But what we are really concerned about is, that it was a duty cast on the Government to have taken the earliest opportunity to place before this House all the facts. Last time they said that investigations are not complete and they want more time. I do not know whether anything has been none now. As a Leader of the Opposition neither myself nor any member of my party have got any scray of paper about the measures they have taken. If this is the way of treating the Leader of the Opposition, I am afraid the democracy is not going to succeed entitled to know what is happening in the Government and the members of the opposition are also entitled to know it. When I complained about this, the next day I got a bundle of

Press Notes issued by the Government. But after that, during this interval I have not had from Government any scrap of paper. I have in my possession a few facts and even according to the members of the Congress party, the Government have not done much and they have not taken adequate measures. They have to allay the public feelings. I want to know what exactly they are doing in this matter.

The other thing that I wish to refer is, in the Business Advisory Committee the allotment of time for the Prohibition Bill was decided.

Sir, I must admit that after we closed the Session I considered over it. We have got 3 hours. Having regard to the magnitude of the discussion and the liveliness that it is likely, to evoke 3½ hours will not be sufficient. I would like to press for the extension of time at the appropriate time.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Sir, I am sorry I was not present and I just came to know about the discussion. We have got the statement ready and we will submit it to-morrow to this House for the information.

THE MYSORE PROHIBITION BILL, 1959.

Motion to Resume Consideration

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Excise, Prohibition and Rural Industries).—I move ;

"Under the proviso to sub-rule (3) of Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure that the Mysore Prohibition Bill, 1959 introduced in the Legislative Assembly on 23rd December 1959 be permitted to be continued."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That under proviso to sub-rule (3) of Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure that the Mysore Prohibition Bill, 1959 introduced in the Legislative Assembly 23rd December 1959 be permitted to be continued."

The motion was adopted.

Motion to Consider.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL.—I move :

"That the Mysore Prohibition Bill, 1959 be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Prohibition Bill, 1959 be taken into consideration.